Remarks/Arguments

The claims 1 - 6, 8 - 14 and 16 stand rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schafer (4,216,975) in view of Evans (2,082,944).

Claim 1 is directed to a rockshaft bearing block structure for an implement lift system, whereas the Evans '944 reference is directed to a connecting rod bearing structure. Schafer '975 shows left and right frames 64 and 66 supporting cups (60 and 62), and his device is carried on a tractor, not on an implement.

Evans 2,082,944 shows a connecting rod bearing structure. Even if arguably the teachings of a remote art such as connecting rod bearings could be fairly applied in the present situation, there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to modify the rockshaft bearing cups 60 and 62 and the frames 66 and 68 of the tractor hitch structure of Schafer with the teachings of Evans. In any event, to provide first and second bearing block sections and connector structure as set forth in applicants' claim 1, the frames of Schafer would have to be widened and split. There simply is not room in the hitch configuration of Schafer as shown. Applicants' split construction, even if there were some way to provide space, would likely be avoided since split sections on the frame would weaken the frames. Further, applicants' structure facilitates replacement of the bearing block inserts without need to dismount the implement lift structure from the implement frame. On a rear tractor hitch, the implement can simply be removed so that unlike applicants' implement lift system, implement weight or support is not an issue with respect to any bearing part replacement.

A problem to be overcome with the present invention is the easy replacement of wear surfaces in a lift system rockshaft. Applicants' claimed arrangement includes releasable connecting structure securing the first bearing block section to the second bearing block section and against the implement frame to facilitate placement of the bearing block inserts in the cavities without need to fully dismount the rockshaft of implement lift structure from the implement frame. The references fail to even

remotely suggest either applicants' problem or applicants' unique solution to the problem, and only with impermissible hindsight would the combined teachings of the references even remotely suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art applicants' unique solution as set forth in the claims.

Therefore, claim 1 and claims 2 - 10 dependent therefrom are believed to be in order for allowance.

Claim 11 sets forth bearing block inserts including a contact area adapted for non-rotatably indexing the inserts relative to the bearing block structure, and further including connector structure securing the first bearing block section to the second bearing block section and against the implement frame, the connector structure releasable to facilitate placement of the bearing block inserts in the cavities without need to dismount the implement lift structure from the implement frame.
As pointed out with respect to claim 1, on a rear tractor hitch such as shown in Schafer, the implement can simply be removed so that unlike applicants' implement lift system, implement weight or support is not an issue with respect to any bearing part replacement. Again, it is believed that the cited references actually teach away from applicants' claimed arrangement. There is believed to be no reason, and certainly no teaching, to modify the rockshaft bearing cups/frames of Schafer with the teachings of an engine connecting rod bearing arrangement of the type shown in Evans. As pointed out with respect to claim 1, applicants' construction would be avoided. Again, the references fail to suggest either applicants' problem or applicants' unique solution to the problem without impermissible use of hindsight.

Therefore, claim 11 and claims 12 - 17 are believed to be in order for allowance.

With regard to claim 15, it is believed that Novoselsky 6,100,809 in any combination with the remaining references, fails to show or suggest the claimed structure with anti-rotation structure adapted for support between the bearing block sections within the cavities. The anti-rotation structure has an edge defining an insert wear warning device providing an audible signal when the inserts wear to a

preselected level. This simple arrangement for an agricultural implement in combination with the lift structure set forth in claim 11 is believed to not be shown or suggested by the references, including Schafer, Evans and Novoselsky (showing a complicated electronic arrangement for an aircraft generator). Therefore, claim 15 is believed to be clearly allowable over the references.

It is applicants' contention that a fair reading of the prior art, without the impermissible use of hindsight after viewing applicants' invention, does not teach the novel combination of structure set forth in the claims, nor is the claimed structure an obvious modification or combination of the prior art.

Any fees or charges due as a result of filing of the present paper may be charged against Deposit Account 04-0525. Two duplicates of this page are enclosed.

Respectfully,

Attorney for Applicants

Duane A. Coordes
Reg. No. 27,531
Patent Department
Deere & Company
One John Deere Place
Moline, IL 61265
Telephone No. (309) 765-4383

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
on: 28 Feb. 2005
Date

Deere & Company
Becky Hansen 28 Feb. 2005
Signature Date